IN THE DRAWINGS:

Figure 22 has been changed herein to be labeled as "Prior Art". Further, the sheet containing Figure 22 is labeled as "Replacement Sheet" in the top margin.

Approval of amended Figure 22 is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-6 have been amended. New claim 7 has been added. Claims 1-7 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented, and approval of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

CHANGED TO THE DRAWINGS

On page 2, item 3, of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the drawings, stating that Figure 22 should be designated as "Prior Art."

Accordingly, Figure 22 has been labeled herein as "Prior Art". Further, the sheet including Figure 22 has been labeled as "Replacement Sheet" in the top margin. Indication of acceptance is respectfully requested in the next Action.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 2-4 AND 6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 2-4 and 6 are rejected since independent claim 2 is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 2 is amended herein to be directed to statutory subject. Thus, the rejection thereof, as well as the rejections of its dependent claims 3, 4 and 6, are respectfully overcome.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 2-4 AND 6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claims 2-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, since one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention, since the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 2-4 and 6 have been amended herein to recite hardware necessary to execute the recited features thereof. It is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would know how to use the claimed invention. Thus, the rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 2-4 AND 6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 2-4 and 6 are rejected as being incomplete for omitting essential elements.

Claims 2-4 and 6 have been amended herein to recite hardware necessary to execute the recited features thereof. Thus, the rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-6 UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF OBVOIUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING

At page 4, item 9, of the Office Action, claims 1-6 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,143 (hereinafter "'143"). The Examiner states that although the claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from the claims recited in '143.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that claims 1-6 are not patentably distinct from the claims recited in '143. For example, claim 1, of the present application, recites storing a first set of reactions at a first computer, and a second set of reactions at a second computer, where each reaction in the first set comprises indicia of one of a plurality of operations available for performance on the first computer and execution information associated with each identified operation, and where each reaction in the second set comprises indicia of one of a plurality of operations available for performance on the second computer and execution information associated with each identified operation.

Claims 1-22 of '143 do not recite that each reaction in a set comprises indicia of one of a plurality of operations available for performance, as recited in claim 1.

Further, claims 2-6 are directed to a computer readable storage medium. The claims recited in '143 are directed to a network system connecting a plurality of computers.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the double patenting rejections of claim 1-6 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Specification is object to as failing to adequately teach the claimed limitations of "indicia of one of a plurality of operations available for performance on the first computer", "indicia of one of a plurality of operations available for performance on the second computer" and "indicia of the one or more performed operations", as recited in claim 1.

It is submitted that the "indicia" recited in claim 1 refers to the Subject (T1), Verb (T2), Object 1 (T3) and Object 2 (T4), as clearly shown in Fig. 3. Subject (T1), Verb (T2), Object 1 (T3) and Object 2 (T4) are indicia of the operations available for performance (T5). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the disclosure adequately teaches the claimed

limitations and, thus, the objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 1 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 1 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention, since claim 1, line 13, recites "receiving the transmission at the second and third computers".

Claim 1 is amended herein to recite "receiving the transmission at the first and second computers", as shown in the claim amendments herein.

Furthermore, Applicants believe the Examiner correctly suggests amending claim 1, at line 17, by adding the word "corresponds".

Finally, Applicants believe the Examiner correctly suggests amending claim 1, at lines 15 and 18, to change the word "plurality" to "set", in order to maintain proper antecedent bases.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1, 2, AND 4 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER COBBAERT ET AL. (U.S. 2003/0079046)

The rejections of claims 1, 2 and 4 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Cobbaert et al. (hereinafter "Cobbaert") is directed to a method and apparatus for accessing the continuation between one program object and another program object by a type of continuation (see paragraph [0007]).

On the other hand, the present invention is directed to a method for providing an enhanced amount of freedom of cooperation between objects connected to a network. The present invention's objects uniquely react to a received transmission at another program object (or another computer).

As recited in claim 1, for example, recites "...a third computer, performing one or more operations of a first plurality of operations available for performance at the third computer; in response to the performing one or more operations at the third computer, generating a transmission comprising *indicia* of the one or more performed operations and information operated on by each of the one or more operations; receiving the transmission at the first and second computers; at the first computer, determining whether the received *indicia* corresponds to at least one of the first set of reactions, and if it does, performing an execution using the

associated execution information of the one of the first set of reactions; and at the second computer, determining whether the received *indicia* corresponds to at least one of the second set of reactions, and if it does, performing an execution using the associated execution information of the one of the second set of reactions." (Emphasis added).

Therefore, according to the present invention, it is not necessary to direct the transmission to each object, but only a message (indicia) in a predetermined format to the network.

It is respectfully submitted that Cobbaert neither teaches nor suggests the features of claim 1.

Similarly, claim 2 recites "when original operations are executed, transmitting messages on a communication path whereby objects receive the messages, where the messages have a format shared by the objects, and where each message indicates the operation type of its corresponding executed operation; and when messages so transmitted from the objects are received, determining whether to react to each message based on each message's indicated operation type, and when determined to react to a given message, reacting by executing a reaction operation that is pre-associated with the message's indicated operation type, where each object has its own set of reaction operations and pre-registered associations between its reaction operations and at least some of the operation types."

Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 patentably distinguishes over the reference.

Claim 4 depends from claim 2 and inherits its patentable recitations. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 3, 5 AND 6 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER COBBAERT ET AL., AS APPLIED TO CLAIM 2, IN VIEW OF HAO ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 5,844,553)

The rejections of claims 3, 5 and 6 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Hao et al. (hereinafter "Hao") is directed to a system for multicasting events to a plurality of applications based on a hierarchical data array.

On the other hand, the present invention is directed to a method of multicasting a predetermined format message (indicia) to all program objects (or all computers) on a network, and each object (or computer) reacts to the message based on a set of reactions stored at each computer.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Cobbaert nor Hao teaches or suggests the features of claim 2. Claims 3, 5 and 6 depend from claim 2 and inherit the patentable recitations thereof. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 5 and 6 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

NEW INDEPENDENT CLAIM 7

New claim 7 recites:

> A network communication apparatus, comprising:
> means for executing original operations of different operation types;
> means for, when original operations are executed, transmitting messages on a communication path whereby objects receive the messages, where the messages have a format shared by the objects, and where each message indicates the operation type of its corresponding executed operation; and
> means for, when messages so transmitted from the objects are received, determining whether to react to each message based on each message's indicated operation type, and when determined to react to a given message, reacting by executing a reaction operation that is pre-associated with the message's indicated operation type, where each object has its own set of reaction operations and pre-registered associations between its reaction operations and at least some of the operation types.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 19, 2005

By: _____
David M. Pitcher
Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501